

LIBRARY  
SUPREME COURT, U. S.  
**In the Supreme Court**  
OF THE  
**United States**

Office-Supreme Court, U. S.  
**FILED**  
OCT 4 1951  
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY  
CLERK

OCTOBER TERM, 1951

4  
~~No. 78~~

CHARLES AUGUSTUS DIXON,  
*Petitioner,*  
VS.  
CLINTON T. DUFFY, Warden,  
San Quentin Prison,  
*Respondent.*

On Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court  
of the State of California.

**BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT.**

EDMUND G. BROWN,  
Attorney General of the State of California,  
CLARENCE A. LINN,  
Assistant Attorney General of the State of California,  
HOWARD S. GOLDIN,  
Deputy Attorney General of the State of California,  
600 State Building, San Francisco 2, California,  
*Attorneys for Respondent.*

## Subject Index

	Page
Opinion below .....	1
Jurisdiction .....	2
Questions presented .....	2
Statement of the case .....	3
Statement of facts .....	4
1. The facts disclosed by the petition for habeas corpus .....	4
2. The facts as disclosed by the opinion order of the United States District Court suppressing the evidence .....	7
3. The facts as shown at the trial in the state court .....	8
Summary of the argument .....	9
Argument .....	10
1. (It not appearing that the state court passed upon a federal question when it denied petitioner's application for a writ of habeas corpus, this court cannot review the state court's action by certiorari .....	10
(a) In California a collateral attack on the final judgment of a nisi prius court by way of habeas corpus cannot be used as a substitute for an appeal .....	10
(b) The petition for the writ of habeas corpus was insufficient under California law .....	15
2. Petitioner having failed to avail himself of his right to correct the alleged error committed by this California court by the way of appeal cannot use a habeas corpus proceeding as a writ of error .....	16
3. A state as well as the federal government may denounce the counterfeiting of federal obligations .....	17
4. A ruling by a federal nisi prius court excluding evidence is not controlling in another cause pending in a state court .....	18
5. Although California rejects the doctrine of the Weeks case nevertheless the right of the citizen to be immune from unreasonable searches and seizures is recognized and adequately protected by the laws of the state .....	20
Conclusion .....	30

## Table of Authorities Cited

Cases	Page
Abbott v. Cooper, 218 Cal.	425
Bell, In re, 19 Cal. (2d)	488
Bozel v. Hudspeth (1942), 126 Fed. (2d)	585
Brinegar v. United States, 338 U. S.	160
Byrnes, In re, 26 Cal. (2d)	824
Coastwise Lumber and Supply Co. v. U. S. (1919), 259 Fed.	847
Cogen v. U. S. (1929), 278 U.S. 221, 73 L. Ed. 282, 49 S.	Ct. 120
Ellias v. Pasmore (K.B. 1934, Vol. 2)	
Entick v. Carrington, 19 How. State Trials	1030
Foley v. U. S. (1933), 64 Fed. (2d)	1
Fox v. Ohio, 46 U. S. (5 How.)	410, 12 L. Ed. 213
Goto v. Lane, 265 U. S.	393
Harris v. United States, 331 U. S.	144
Herbert v. Louisiana, 272 U. S.	212
Herter v. U. S. (1929), 33 Fed. (2d)	402
Leach v. Money, 19 How. State Trials	1002
Lindley, In re, 29 Cal. (2d)	709
Martin v. Superior Court, 176 Cal.	289
McVickers, In re, 29 Cal. (2d)	264
Nardone v. U. S., 308 U.S. 338, 60 S. Ct. 266, 84 L. Ed.	307
People v. Adamson, 34 Cal. (2d)	320
People v. Defore, 242 N. Y.	13
People v. Gonzales, 20 Cal. (2d)	165
People v. Grososky, 73 Cal. App. (2d)	15, 165 P. (2d) 157
People v. Mayen, 188 Cal.	237
People v. McDonnell, 89 Cal.	285, 22 Pac. 190
People v. Rochin, 101 Cal. App. (2d)	140